

DEISM Defeated,

AND CHRISTIANITY Defended;

OR, THE

Evidence for Christianity set in a New
Light and proved to amount to Certainty;

AND THE

Present Controversy between Dr. TINDAL,
Dr. WATERLAND, and others, relating
to the Case between Reason and Revela-
tion stated and solved.

Occasion'd by a late Pamphlet, Entituled,

*A Demonstration of the Insufficiency both of
Reason and Revelation, separately or joint-
ly consider'd, in Matters of Religion. With
a Conclusion shewing what is sufficient.*

Detesting that Author, by the Principles of this
Pamphlet, to be an Infidel in a Quaker's Coat.

By JOHN HENLEY, M. A.

Late of St. John's College, Cambridge.

L O N D O N,

Printed: And Sold by J. ROBERTS, near the
Oxford Arms in Warwick-lane.

MDCCXXXI.

(Price Six-pence.)

Mr. Wilson bought
of me a medal
called perpetual of
craze, Hobbs, for every
Sunday, for himself &
Family, while he lived
he preserving & showing
y^e Law, or receiving of
a consideration
Copy-right of this
Lecture, with Liberty
of dedication. y^e medal to
be forfeited, if others used
it, or y^e Copy right also.



To the Right Honourable the
Lord *WILMINGTON*,
Lord P R E S I D E N T
O F
His M A J E S T Y's most
Honourable Privy-Council,
T H I S
L E C T U R E
Is Humbly Inscrib'd

By His Lordship's

Most Obedient and

Most Humble Servant,

J. HENLEY.

To the Right Honourable the

Lord WILLIAMSON

of the High Court of Chancery

LUKE xviii. 8.

When the Son of man cometh, will he find faith on the earth?

THIS Lecture is occasion'd by a Discourse lately published, Entitled, 'The Insufficiency of Reason, or jointly considered, in Matters of Religion, with a Conclusion, shewing, what is sufficient for the Deists and Unbelievers having set up a great Wall and Acquiescence against Religion, some incidental Freedom of that Tendency may be pardonable in Defence of it, supported by Reason, and the Learning of the Problem.

My first Remark on the Title is, that it shews the Insufficiency of the

LUKE xviii. 8.

When the Son of man cometh, will he find faith on the earth?

THIS Lecture is occasion'd by a Discourse, lately publish'd, Entituled, *A Demonstration of the Insufficiency both of Reason and Revelation, separately or jointly consider'd, in Matters of Religion, with a Conclusion, shewing what is sufficient.* The Deists and Unbelievers having set up for great Wit and Acuteness against Religion, some incidental Freedom of that Tendency may be pardonable, in Defence of it, supported by Reason, and the Learning of the Problem.

My first Remark on the Title, is, that it shews the Insufficiency of the

Au-

Author's Modesty, and the Sufficiency of his Conceit. He opens his Publication with a Paradox, for Surprise and Curiosity, to catch the unwary Fish with the Bait of Free-thinking, and Traffic on the Fancy.

The Title is larded with an illecook'd Mixture from *Shaftesbury, the Bible, and the Thirty Nine Articles*, to take in the Deist, the Christian, and the Church-man; the first Motto, like the Title, fights with it self: "Philosopher, where are thy Ideas? Where is Truth? Certainty, Evidence so much talk'd of?" In that Free-thinking Catechism, my Lord *Shaftesbury* would prove the Children of this World, wiser than the Children of Light. Yet he only treads in the Steps of *Des Cartes*, the French Free-thinker, who first doubted off his own Being, to lay the Foundation of Certainty in Uncertainty, by his Language, and pause to ask himself a wise Question, whether there was such a Thing as *Des Cartes* in the World? the

the Cause was like the Case of the Deists; being out of himself, he could not determine whether he was at all.

And *Des Cartes*, in this only follow'd the old *Pyrrhonists*, and retail'd a thin worn-out Remnant of that curious Seeker, who never found, that successful Runner after Truth, who never overtook it, *Sextus Empiricus*: Yet the Deists would be thought New and Wise, tho' their Forefathers, the *Academicks* of *Athens*, were not new above 2000 Years ago, and tho' they are old enough to be now wiser, they are got no farther, than the old Question, What is Truth, like *Pilate*, or where is Evidence, in the Phrase of *Aspley Cooper*? These are the Men that would instruct us, tho' they profess they know nothing; they are now sure they ask the Question; we are likely to be taught by Deists, and grounded in Faith by Infidels. They are so far from it, indeed,

indeed, as to be Professors of Ignorance, they let us know what Wisdom we are to expect from them.

Where is Certainty, so much talk'd of, says Shaftesbury? his *owning it was talk'd of* proves that certain; and therefore, *evident and true*: he is so kind, as to answer his own Query: Anthony Ashley Cooper inquires, and Shaftesbury replies. Pilate's Question is here solv'd: and a Principle given by these cunning Scepticks to find out *any Truth, any Certainty*, that has the same Evidence in its kind, with this, "A Thing so much talk'd of." Were there, *no* such things, as Evidence, Certainty, Truth, he could not inquire about them; he asks for *something*, therefore they are Realities, they exist. If he asks for nothing, *that is true, certain, and evident*, that he *does* ask.

The Substance of the Quotations from St. Paul, and the Thirty nine Articles, are part of the Argument it self, that is deduc'd in the following Pages.

St. Paul denies that meer natural Reason can know the Things of Revelation, and the Articles deny, that Man can please God any way, but thro' Christ, apply'd by God's Grace, which is Scripture-Doctrine, and true. In the Preface and Book, the Author, methinks, should not have offer'd to *reason*, because he said himself that Reason is not sufficient; he begins his Preface with a *Contradiction in Terms*, "That every Book with impartial Judges will stand or fall by its own *Intrinsic* worth or Imperfection"; the Word, Judges, implies it is to stand or fall by *Judgment* of it, not merely by *it self*; and the Word, *Intrinsic*, implies it is to stand by it self only, and *irrespectively* to any thing else. Such Reason is very insufficient; we may find so much Truth in this Writer, that he proves his Title, by neither having Reason, nor Revelation.

Page 3. of the Preface, he tells us, that he "Intends only to restore Re-

“ligion to its primitive Purity and Per-
 “fection, which has been intirely dis-
 “regarded in the present Controversy :”
 Whereas Dr. Tindal, one of the Con-
 trovertists, expressly refers his Design,
 in his Book, *Christianity as old as the*
Creation, and in all his Writings, to
 the cutting off Innovations and Ex-
 crescencies, and restoring Religion to
 its primitive Purity : So the Pastoral
 Letters aim at the same Point, by re-
 ducing reveal’d Religion to the Bible,
 which is its primitive Purity and Per-
 fection. The whole Pretension of
 Deism is, in their Sense, to restore the
 Purity of Religion to the Law of Na-
 ture : So that this Writer has not
 learnt the *Primer* of the Dispute.

Page 4. he affirms, “That Reason is
 “not sufficient to discover the Will of
 “God, because, his Nature being in-
 “comprehensible, we cannot know his
 “Will, nor therefore practise it.”

This, indeed, proves, that we can-
 not know nor comprehend all of God’s

Na-

Nature and Will, nor therefore practise all of it: but we know in Part, says Paul; and also, we obey, according to the Grace that is given to us: as we are finite Creatures, and God is infinite, we cannot, by any Method, perfectly comprehend him. But we can apprehend what he is pleas'd to declare and what we are able to conceive; *Space is infinite*; a Philosopher cannot therefore comprehend all of *Space*; but he can know Part of it, and argue, and apply, what he knows. It is so with our Knowledge of God. It does not follow, that because he cannot, being incomprehensible, in his Infinity, be perfectly known, therefore he cannot be known in any degree; it is a Contradiction, for knowing him to be incomprehensible, is in some degree knowing him, otherwise we could not even affirm that: and in this same Paragraph, this Author overthrows himself, for he quotes a Passage out of *Job*, part of *God's Will*, declaring, that

B 2

by

by search we cannot find God to per-
 fection; to prove, that we cannot know
 his will in all. (which is no Critick.) for they are no
 to Part we may know and of that Part
 found only by Revelation. Internal
 He goes on Page 41. That external
 and internal Revelation, to which is a
 Trick. In the Title he called it Revela-
 tion at large, it is not sufficient, ap-
 pears in that Revelation shews its own
 insufficiency without Supernatural As-
 sistance, or immediate Inspiration of
 the Spirit, to judge of the Sense; and
 that external Revelation cannot be un-
 derstood without the internal Spirit.
 Here, Revelation in the Title is
 External Revelation, apart from the Spi-
 rit, which is so far from being Novel,
 as he says after, that he owns it again
 Revelation in itself and this is supposed,
 and understood from the very Expres-
 sions of Revelation, that the Grace or
 Spirit of God must accompany it, to
 give us a right Sense of it; which is not
 Part of the present Controversy Between
 us

Rea-

Reason and Revelation no Christians;
but the *Quakers* (if they be Christians,
for they are *no Criticks*,) and they of
that time, ~~do not~~ deny'd the Necessity of
the *internal Spirit* to understand Reve-
lation; the *Quakers* indeed have a pe-
culiar System of interpreting that Light;
but this is not the *present Question*;
that, is, Whether so much of God's
Will as is necessary to a well-ground-
ed Confidence in his Mercy and Ac-
commodation can be known, without
his own Communication of it: "Re-
velation is not so to us till understood
by the help of God's Spirit; there-
fore Men must frame their Minds and
Hearts by what they rationally know
of God to receive his Grace for know-
ing more by his Revelation. If the
Author be out of the Question in the
Preface, he probably goes wider from
it in the Book, so that instead of fol-
lowing the Point, he leaves that
to follow him: the merest Novice
or Child in his Catechism knows
that

that God's Grace is needful to know
 and do God's will. This Author is a
 very profound Scholar, to fetch out so
 wonderful a Discovery; and an expert
 Logician to make that his Subject
 which does not belong to it; but he
 was to prove Reason insufficient.

on Page 1. of his Book, he turns the
 Disputes to a Law-suit, and tells us
 of Rejoinders, and Sur-rejoinders:
 Page 2, to a Picture, for, he says, there
 are Master-strokes in it: Then he is
 a Politician, for he says, Reason is an
 Ally to Religion; Page 4, he divides
 his Terms to explain them; Page 5,
 he produces a Definition of Sufficiency
 from what he calls a Whiffler in the
 Controversy; he tells that for a Word
 of Disgrace, whereas a Whiffler is one
 that accidentally examines an Univer-
 sity Student for his Degree; however,
 was in a Word of lessening, it would
 only shew, that he has not the Spirit
 by using it; and yet he gives Page 6,
 a Definition of Sufficiency; that is the
 same for many set less than their
 name

same with his *Whiffers*, both amounting to "a Power in all, at all Times, to know and practise Religion," he might have said, as far as it is required, to the utmost of his Ability, by a Progress in Good, and Avoidance of Evil: This, indeed, may seem to be included in the Word, Power, and the Word, Religion, *practicable divine Obligation*; but it is a close Phrase, and shewing the Thing at once, should be added, to illustrate the Definition, and prevent Sophistry.

Page 8, he concludes the *Insufficiency of Reason and Revelation from Practice*: Because, says he, what we see and experience proves the Power of Men, not any abstract metaphysical Reasoning: Yet all Reasoning on the Powers of Men is not Metaphysical; and the *Practice* of Men may not be according to their Power, and therefore, not Religion: He confounds the Power with the *Act*, which is not the same Things; for many act less than their Power,

Power, otherwise than they judge most rational. Therefore this is no Proof of the Insufficiency of Reason and Revelation in Religion, that Men do not practise it, because they may and ought so to do. Disobeying the Laws of a State does not prove those Laws insufficient, but the Actions only of the Guilty; it is the same with the Laws of God. And as no Laws oblige, till promulg'd, therefore the original Evidence of Scripture is given to be made known to all Men by Preaching, and Argument, the Holy Ghost cooperating: And it may be Want of that Grace, a Fault in a Person's Heart, as well as Understanding, not to believe them.

So that this Author might have spar'd Page 8 to the 12th, Deductions from the Practice of Men; Page 11, he says, it is almost impossible for a Man to hold that Balance between his Passions, and Power, which Religion requires. By the Words, *almost*

impossible he owns it is not *quite*
impossible; tho' difficult, the Reward
 and Motives are an Over-balance.
Revelation is not less true, tho' Men
 deny, or obscure it: he allow'd in
 his Preface, that a Book must stand
 by its intrinsic Worth: let him al-
 low that to the Bible: *Mathema-*
ticks are not false, because most are
 ignorant of them; *London is a City*,
 tho' some have not heard of it; and
 this Writer may have Sense, tho' we
 cannot see it in this Pamphlet.
 Page 3. he remarks an Objecti-
 on, that Men situated under the
 Force of Imposture, Ignorance, and
 Credulity may yet by mere Reason
 discern and practise Religion. He
 says, that is impossible. What he
 asserts is false; for they have yet
Power and Faculties to know what
 is yet not made known to them.
 A Country Peasant may have an
 ability to know an Act of Parliament
 tho' hitherto he has not met with it.

Revelation requires nothing but what is practicable: But Men *deceive* *their* own Hearts, and *cavil*, while they ought to pray: We could not know, that a Man's fearing God, and working Righteousness in any Nation would make him accepted, had not God himself told us so in Christ: We might have reason'd with doubt about it: But the highest Evidence is in Revelation; and that Revelation is a Matter of Fact: However conceal'd or perverted in the Representation or Use, it is still not less a Fact: And it is vain to debate now, whether it be necessary or sufficient, when it is Fact, and ought to be receiv'd.

God spoke in divers Manners, and therefore all are some kind of Revelation. Reason itself is a Degree of his Voice in the Soul: The Works of God reveal something more of him; the Word of God more still; the Spirit of God adds to all these Methods of Reve-

Revelation; and these Parts together, make the *whole* of it; to argue, therefore, whether *Reason* or *Revelation* be sufficient, is to argue, whether a *Part* of *Revelation* be the *whole*: This is the short State and *Solution* of this *Problem*; in which concise Light I do not find that any Disputant on either Hand has put it; and the Evidence that these Parts are *Revelation* is to be judged by the common *Criterion* of Truth, *Self-evidence*; for Faith is by *hearing*, that is, by the Conveyance of the Senses first, and *hearing*, by the Word of God.

It was once true that God gave Laws to Men; therefore it is always true; no Time, Place, Persons or Circumstances can make that not to be, which is *Fact*. God's speaking to Moses was as evident to him as a Man's speaking to his Friend; Mens disputing about the Passage thro' the Red-Sea, no more proves, he and his People did not pass it,

than it proves, there never was a
Red-Sea; or One so called *Wool-*
Shear's running Divisions on Christ's
 Miracles can never make them *not*
to have been done; The Denys deny-
 ing Scripture is no Argument that
 it is *not* Scripture; my wondering
 how they can deny it is no Reason
 to them, against the Fact, that they
 do deny it. Sufficient or not, in
 Mens wrangling, necessary or not,
 it is true, it is from God; there is
 Evidence of that equal to my speak-
 ing and standing in this Congrega-
 tion; and greater; for the Eyes, and
 Ears, and Senses, of more, and more
 prejudic'd, and more distant, and
 as wise and honest Persons, wouch
 for God and Christ's speaking, as
 can for mine at this present Mo-
 ment. Here is the *fulfillment* Cause, the
 Cause of *Revelation*; It is so; there-
 fore it is, for every man and those who
 know do not know, and know not
 it sometime, it is not impossible, and
 it

it is the Business of Preachers, and
 All Christians, to make the Ignorant,
 that is, the Unbelieving, acquainted
 with it. The Spirit of God teaches
 the things of God; he that doth the
 Will shall know of the Doctrine:
 Therefore let a Deist say his Prayers,
 and practise the Laws of the Gospel,
 and God will give him Grace to be-
 lieve. Faith is said and presumed in
 Scripture to be a Grace of God; and
 he may take himself for a Wit, and
 a Scholar, and a Philosopher; for
 putting off Conviction, to quibble
 and sophisticate, when it is only
 his Ignorance or Depravity. Let
 him implore God in Christ to open
 the wondrous Things of his Law,
 and he will see them; but if he be
 not inclin'd to supplication, and prac-
 tise it, he never will believe it, and
 will suffer for Want of Grace. *Benedicite
 et benedicite*, that was the
 good old Divinity. Let a Deist con-
 sider and repent of his Sins, and he
 as impossible as it is to be otherwise.

will soon find a *Saviour needful*, and will say; *Lord, I believe, HELP THOU MY UNBELIEF*. Where will they have Comfort on their Death-beds, or in Distress, or ill Conscience? Their own Reason yields it not; the more they think, the more they are entangled: Let them try the Experiment; go out of their dear boasted Selves to a better Self, *God and Jesus Christ*; this will *sanc-tify the Beast to a Sacrifice, bruising the Heart* on the Altar of Contri-tion, and wounding it with the *Sti-mulus* of holy Compunction.

False Judgment of Revelation is not the Fallhood of Revelation it-self; Page 17, this Writer tells us, that "Written Tradition is liable to Change, Error, and Misunder-standing; but so also is internal Revelation possibly obnoxious to Un-certainties;" and this would hold equally against both: He says, the Re-velation must be a clear and dis-tinct

tinct Conveyance of the Will of
 God; so is the Scripture, when
 known and understood; and till then,
 his internal Revelation is not suffi-
 cient; Page 23, he infers, that since
 God is infinitely good, and wise,
 and powerful, it was impossible for it
 not to be truly convey'd; therefore
 the written Word is not sufficient Re-
 velation, because possibly that might
 be corrupted. But the internal Tes-
 timony may be imagin'd also, when it
 is not; and none pretends written
 Revelation is sufficient without God's
 Spirit. He encounters his own Sha-
 dow; this is not the Question: That
 is, whether the Scriptures be *Fact,*
True and Divine.

By insisting Page 24, on *Infal-*
lible Conveyance of Revelation, he de-
 stroys his own internal Revelation;
 for that is not infallible: And drives
 his Readers to the Church of Rome,
 like the *Head of Swine into the Wa-*
ters: Page 25 to 31, and so on,
 de-

debating why the Evidence of Revelation ought to reach farther than Probability, or Testimony, (for he makes the taking of Revelation on the Credit of Witnesses, taking it on Probability) he is *superfluous* in Criticising so long *another Author's System*; when *that* is not the Principle of *Christian Belief*; the Credit of Witnesses is only Part of the Evidence of Revelation: Not the whole Evidence, so that Probability is not all the Proof of Revelation, and yet he should not call Testimony, as he does, Probability only, at large, because himself makes the Testimony of the Spirit sufficient, which is more than Probability. By this he contradicts himself, and overturns his own Scheme; for the Spirit beareth Witness with our Spirits, that we are the Sons of God. Tho' fallible, tho' deceivable we are, yet Men have Self-Evidence the Evidence of Sense that they are not deceived in Religion, and

and the Possibility of Uncertainty may lie as much on the side of internal, as external Revelation; as this Writer absurdly clashes one with the other, when they belong to each other, as parts, Especially, here, where the Gospel is publicly preach'd, and confess'd: Other Places are secondary to the Question, and their present Unbelief is no Reason, why they should not believe, when inform'd. God neither did, nor was he oblig'd, to reveal himself fully at once. In the whole Duration and Extent of the World, Religion, as well as Morality, is consistent. Nor is this weaken'd by the Apostle's Definition of Faith, that it is the Evidence of Things unseen; That is not an universal Definition of Faith; but of that kind of Faith, which he there describ'd, explaining himself by the other Words, in the same Verse, that it is the Substance of Things hoped for, by which, compar'd with the

following Verſes, he declares, that
 he ſpoke there of the Belief of Chriſt
 ſchcomb among the Patriarchs, for
 by this, ſays he, the Elders obtained
 a good Report, with a particular of
 Noah's Affirmation, I ſaw. And then
 Chriſt was unſeen, yet they believ'd
 his to come, on the ſtrength of his
 Promiſe, to them, Heav'n was un-
 ſeen, yet they believ'd it, by their Faith,
 therefore, that is, a their Belief of
 God's Promiſe of Chriſt, and Hea-
 ven, was the Evidence of Things un-
 ſeen. So is our Faith, and the Apoſtle
 applies that Topic to Chriſtians. And
 But that this Definition was not
 deſign'd to ſhew all Faith, appears
 by this, that the Apoſtles and Diſci-
 ples of Chriſt, when he was upon
 Earth, and viſible, had Faith in him,
 That he was perſonally the Chriſt.
 Their Faith was, not the Evidence of
 Things unſeen, becauſe they ſaw him,
 and ſaw his wonderful Works. And
 likewiſe they who believ'd on Chriſt
 ſaw

upon Earth on the Sight of his
 Works, and they who believed that
 for on View of the Passage thro' the
 Red Sea, or his supernatural Actions
 in Egypt, could not be said in ge-
 neral to have such a Faith as that
 the Apostle mentions, calling it the
 Evidence of Things unseen. As for
 as it is the Evidence of God's invi-
 sible Nature, or of Christ to come,
 or Heaven, it is of Things unseen,
 but the original Evidence of the
 Christian Religion was that of the
 Senses of the Eyes and Ears and
 bodily Organs; Thomas would not
 believe till he felt the Print of the
 Wounds of Christ. Therefore the
 Original Certainty of the Christian
 Religion is *Self-evident*, which is
 the highest Criterion of Truth and
 Certainty, Higher than the Reason-
 ings of *Free-thinkers*, which are not
 built on self-evident Facts, but on
 their own *Speculations*, higher than
 the *Mathematicks*, whose Points, Lines,

Surfaces, Solids, Angles, and Quan-
 tities, are not in Nature, are not
 real Beings, but supposed only.
 And this Original Self-evidence of
 Sense, for the Christian Religion, is
 not taken as from these Persons mean-
 ly that had it: It might as well
 have been that of any other Persons.
 The same Evidence would have been
 convincing to all Persons at all
 Times: Therefore it is a kind of
 Evidence that is not built on their
 Testimony, so much as the Testimony
 of Sense in general. It was then
 sensible beyond doubt, what was so
 can never be made to be otherwise;
 for that now it is the same, for it
 can't be *alter'd*: Therefore it is to
 us the same sensible self-evident
 Proof of Christianity. *How the Devil*
is Defeated: He must change the
 Fact, or we have the same Demon-
 stration now of Christianity on that
 Fact, as when it first appeared.

Page 37. We are told, that Christi-
 anity has not answer'd the end of its
 the Reformation of the World; and
 that the voluminous Disputes about
 it are not to be the necessary Ob-
 ject of every Man's Consideration.
 In answer to this, we cannot di-
 rectly say, how far Christianity has
 not reform'd the World: for it is a
 sudden Life with Christ in God, and
 many have been better'd by it that
 are obscure and unperceiv'd. It
 has had its proper heavenly Effect
 on Multitudes, and it is, in itself,
 conducive to raise human Nature
 to the highest Perfection. The
 Faults of Men are suppos'd, cau-
 tion'd against, and predicted in it:
 the Gospel says and owns, *that few*
would have Faith, and that the Lord
of many taxed gold. It is propos'd,
 for an constant Check on Vice, and
 growth in Virtue, and is not self
 fitted admirably to produce that
 Consequence.

And

And as for *prolix* Disputes, *search*
the Scriptures; all can or soon may
 read, or hear, the Testament; let
 Men spend their time on that
 which they spend ill or vainly;
 there is the needful of Religion.
 Controversies of Men are no ne-
 cessary Bar to the readings of the
 Gospel. Men are oblig'd to that
 but not to read all Controversies.
 It is impossible; none is bound to
 an Impossibility; therefore the Word,
prove all things, must be meant
 to your Power. There is not a
 Christian in the World, Master of
 his Senses, and Judgment, that may
 not easily understand the Bible
 and Testament, in a short Time;
 let him endeavour it: it is his
 Duty to endeavour it; otherwise, he
 is not honest or sincere in his Inten-
 tion to know his Religion.
 It is not essential, that the Con-
 veyance of Revelation should not be
 subject to Doubt, but only that it
 should

should not be subject to reasonable Doubts. Men doubt of it before they examine, and find it true; then they no longer *waver* in the Faith, but come to be rooted and grounded in Love. They may have St. Paul's Plerophory, his Assurance, his Certainty, for the Promise was to our Fathers; and to their Children, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.

And the stale Objection, Page 40. that God did not give this Revelation to all, has no force: for God does give it to all; Christ dy'd for all, and order'd his Disciples to preach it to all Nations: it is their Fault, not the Fault of Revelation, if all Men in the World do not hear of it: for Christians are in all Parts of the Globe, and are bound to propagate it to every Person. This is no Reason, why they who hear of, and know it, do not believe it, and is false in Fact. Nay, it is never

there was a Country without God's Revelation, in Conscience, in Providence, or in his Word: one is a Part of the other: and none have his full Revelation without his Word.

Page 45. he tells us, "The Opinions of Men differ about Religion, and therefore, not Reason, nor external Revelation, are sufficient, but the *Internal*."

In Reply to this, I observe, that they differ as much about the *Internal* as the *External*; so that, if this has Force, it cuts both ways: but all Christians agree, and none differ, in this Creed, "That Christ is the Messiah, the Great Prophet, the Son of God, and that his Will is their Law: that the New Testament in general contains that Will, and that to believe and practise that, is their Obligation;" point me out a Christian that differs from another in *that Faith*, the Manner of interpreting and applying

ing some Particulars of that general Idea may differ, but they agree in that universal Belief: Arians, Socinians, Papists, Protestants, Churchmen, Dissenters, all agree and unite in the Creed aforesaid.

And if they disagreed in that, nay, if none believ'd it, (was that possible, which it is not nor ever can be) it would not be the Fault of *Revelation*, but their *own Fault*; it would still be equally *true and good* in it self, for *the Opinions of Men affect not the Nature of Things*.

Page 48. this profound Reasoner, at the Conclusion of his *Spider's Web*, tells us again, what he said before, (lest the Proposition, being light, should be blown away) that, *therefore*, that is, for his *Reasons* aforesaid, which are shown to be *none*, it follows, that neither Reason nor Revelation are sufficient, but *internal Inspiration*. Yet his *internal Revelation may be* subject to the very

E

same

time in his own way, and he confounds
 all Ideas and Language by the Terms
 of his assertions for internal Inspi-
 ration is both Reason and Revelation;
 it must be judg'd in a great measure
 by natural Reason itself, and in the
 Revelation of God to the Soul only
 as I have shew'd in Part of
 Revelation, and this Author disputes
 gravely whether the Part be the whole,
 which is the whole of his Dispute:
 and indeed, any Part of what is as
 good as the whole, and the whole is
 just as much as any Part of it.
 The Text he quotes, 1st Th^o 4th 13th
 "The Spirit of God is necessary to know
 the Things of God," does not,
 nor can, mean internal Inspiration
 only, because that very Text lies the
 whole of the external Word, and
 all the report of that, and such like
 Expressions, that without God's
 Revelation, in general, in this way,
 we cannot know the Things of God;
 which is true, but not true of In-
 ternal

eternal Revelation only, nor to attend
 editions by the General Word that
 the *Intermitting Spirit* is promised, and
 this amounts to no more than the
 Quaker's *Light Within*, which either
 supposes the *Scripture Knowledge* of
 the *Scripture Promise*, or else is a false
Weapon, and goes out in *darkness*; which
 is the *expiring Snuff* of this Author's
Candle; that would have lasted longer
 under a *Bushel* an *Infidel* in a Qua-
 ker's Coat; so James Naylor translating
Spoken as the whole as good
 as Dr. *Wassington*, in his late Apo-
 logy, has given a kind of Summary
 of the main Arguments for Christi-
 anity; Dr. *Tindal* has not prov'd his
 being that Christianity is nothing but
 the *Law of Nature*; it has added
 several Duties, which, tho' positive,
 are yet moral, for to obey the *Law*
 of *God* is a moral Obligation; Dr.
Waterland has labour'd to vindicate
Scripture in perhaps a closer Style
 of a *new* but not one of

would be more convincing to their Readers.

Let our Prayers be address'd to God in Christ to impart that *Grace of Faith* to the Unbelieving, and that *Ghostly Strength of it* to the Believer, which no Reasoning can fully bestow, and let us to shew our Charity conclude with that Collect to obtain it at the Throne of Grace,

Blessed Lord, &c.

10 JY 57

N. B. It is appeal'd to the learned World, on comparing this *Lecture* with any thing written by the Bishops and Clergy on this Subject, whether they are not something oblig'd to it.

F I N I S.

neir
to
hat
be-
gth
no
ow,
ari-
ect
of

rn-
ure
ops
her
it.